DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 296 402 CS 506 246

AUTHOR Atkin, David; LaRose, Robert
TITLE News and Information on Community Access Channels: Market Concerns amidst the Marketplace of Ideas.
PUB DATE Jul 88
NOTE 34p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (71st, Portland, OR, July 2-5, 1988).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Audience Analysis; Audience Awareness; *Cable Television; Information Sources; Mass Media Use; Programing (Broadcast); Surveys; Television Research; *Television Viewing
IDENTIFIERS Audience Research; Community Access; PEG Program; *Public Access Television

ABSTRACT

Utilizing a regionally diversified sample of cable viewers to investigate viewer patronage of community channels--defined to include public, educational, and government (PEG) access as well as community (or leased) access channels, a study examined a quarterly national survey of homes serviced by cable in the United States. Each quarter, 1,000 homes in cabled areas were interviewed by telephone to establish awareness, viewership, and satisfaction levels for over thirty programming services, including community and access channels. Both the head of the household and a randomly selected household member age 12 or older were interviewed in each home; interviews were completed in 60 percent of the eligible homes listed for the survey and a total of 1322 usable responses were obtained. Other measures included in the study were demographic variables, such as respondent's sex, employment status, marital status, household size, ethnicity, age, education, and income. Results revealed that nearly 60% of all homes serviced by cable were served by at least one community channel, and 16% of the overall audience reported viewing a community channel within the week preceding their interview. Findings also suggested that access viewers were likely to be better educated, older, retired, and have lower incomes. (Nine tables of data, seven footnotes, and 22 references are appended.) (MM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED296402

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
David Atkin
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

NEWS AND INFORMATION ON COMMUNITY ACCESS CHANNELS: MARKET CONCERNS AMIDST THE MARKETPLACE OF IDEAS

by

David Atkin
Department of Radio-Television
Southern Illinois University
Carbondale, IL 62901

and

Robert LaRose
Department of Telecommunication
409 Communication Arts
Michigan State University
East Lansing, MI 48824-1212

Paper presented to the Radio-Television Division, AEJMC, 1988 Meeting, Portland, OR.

CS506246

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NEWS AND INFORMATION ON COMMUNITY ACCESS CHANNELS: MARKET CONCERNS AMIDST THE MARKETPLACE OF IDEAS

Few media policy issues evoke as much passion as the debate concerning access cablevision channels. Recent efforts to keep the Ku Klux Klan off of Kansas City's public access channel are the latest in a series of "public relations" controversies that have plagued access since its inception (Nightline, 1988). This, in light of the marginal audience success, has prompted several communities to reconsider their commitment to access programming.

After the Supreme Court cleared the way for mandatory local origination (Midwest Video I, 1972), it later vacated Federal Communications Commission (FCC) mandates for public, educational and government (PEG) access channels (Midwest Video II, 1979). Interest in the issue subsided until 1984, when Congress reexamined access in debates concerning the 1984 Cable Communications Act (P.L. 98-583). In the end, Congress struck a balance between citizen's groups, seeking widespread access, and cable operators, who were opposed to such mandates. Operators were ordered to devote a portion of their channel space (typically 10%) for "community access" channels, to be made available on a leased basis.

Aside from that, communities have been allowed to request the provision of PEG access, but channel carriage remains a matter of negotiation. In the absence of any Congressional mandates for PEG channels, cable operators have been anxious to

reduce their public access burden (Baldwin & McVoy, 1988). This pressure has forced access patrons to provide a strict accounting of materials used for community news programming appearing on PEG channels. Many have countered by improving production techniques and audience analyses, hoping to provide marketplace justification for their electronic forum. This paper examines performance issues concerning PEG channels, analyzing recent trends in terms of awareness, interest, viewership and viewer satisfaction with local access news and information programming.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Social movements favoring community channels can be traced to the late 1960s, when "criticism of mass media was reaching a crescendo and cable television was being viewed as a panacea for the ills of the media and even of society" (Schmidt, 1976:56). These channels were intended to provide access to a telecast medium which is structurally characterized by a scarcity of outlets (for broadcast sources) and monopolistic ownership (for cable city franchises). As of the early 1980s, roughly 1000 of the nation's 6500 cable systems operated some form of access or local origination channel (Verska, 1984).

There has emerged, however, a conflict between the citizen's rights to access and the cable owner's right to earn a profit. As Owen (1975) notes, the access channel generally provides:

> "...greater competition among stations, a greater range of choices for viewers, a greater forum of local issues and breaks the monopoly local newspapers...It also runs against the profit instinct" (:112)

This observation is rooted in the low viewership levels noted

during the 1970s. For example, Johnson and Agostino (1975) found that .2% of all viewing in Columbus, Indiana involved public access. A similar Warner Amex survey found that .7% of all viewing involved public access in its now defunct Columbus, Ohio Qube system (Advocat, 1984).

Access programmers, of course, take exception with the latter findings--suggesting that Warner and other cable systems have a financial interest in underestimating PEG channel use. That is, in light of production cost increases and low ratings, cable operators are now anxious to allocate PEG channel space to more lucrative commercial uses. Suggesting that it takes time for such channels to "catch on," one programmer noted that access attracts from 27% to 38% of cable viewers, on a weekly basis (see Advocat, 1984). East Lansing, Michigan, is another successful example, where comparable weekly viewership ranges as high as 75% of the cable audience (Strother, 1985).

Most recently, Porter and Banks (1987) found that 51% of TV viewers in Milwaukee were aware of public access; of them, 64% reported that they never watch it. The authors found that this "...moderate..." level of awareness was accompanied by strong perceptions of the channels being "...accessible and contributing to the marketplace of ideas" (1986:2).

Assessing the content of that marketplace, Wurtzel (1975) classified public access programming into the following categories: news, public affairs, religious, instructional, sports, political, children's, experimental art, entertainment

and informational; the latter two categories accounted for 80% of all programming studied. Doty (1975) found 95% of all public access programming involved one of two formats: (1) what television jargon calls "talking heads" (news, interviewers) and (2) videotapes of "real events" (p. 37).

Given this emphasis on low-cost community-oriented fare, access programmers have faced challenges in promoting specific programs. Johnson and Agostino (1975) found that, among those who've watched access programming in Columbus, IN, 57.8% rely on newspapers for their program information; others happen on to it while changing channels (26.7%) or get information from friends (20%). People who watched such programming felt that its major shortcoming was picture quality. Those who thought the sound quality good, the general educational value high and the creativity high tended to be heavier users.

Where academic studies such as these provide a clear understanding of community channel performance within individual communities at a given point in time, our understanding of channel performance across the country is still incomplete. Most of the research in this area was conducted at a time when 30% or fewer of U.S. TV households subscribed to cable. Clearly, changes in competing cable services, video technologies and channel carriage policies underscore the need to reexamine channel performance (LaRose and Atkin, 1988).

The same is true with regard to geography. For instance, many of the communities studied represent college towns and major

urban areas. As Schmidt (1976) notes, it is logical to expect that viewership of PEG channels would be higher in those types of systems. Simply put, communities such as Columbus, OH or Manhattan, NY are scarcely representative of the country as a whole; these areas are likely to rank well above the national average with regard to such factors as income and education (see Krugman, 1985). Clearly, larger and more geographically varied samples would give us greater confidence in the generalizability of research findings.

While nonacademic studies provide information across a wider geographic scope, discrepancies in viewing estimates between cable system operators and access programmers undermine those findings. This study was undertaken to investigate viewer patronage of community channels, utilizing a regionally diversified sample of cable viewers.

METHODOLOGY

The results presented here are based on a quarterly national survey of homes passed by cable in the United States (ELRA, 1985 1986)[1]. Each quarter, 1000 homes in cabled areas are interviewed by telephone to establish awareness, viewership and satisfaction levels for over thirty programming services. Community and access channels have been included in this survey since 1985.

A four-stage sampling procedure was used to select cable systems, households passed by cable and persons within households. To begin, a master sample of cable systems was drawn from

an industry directory[2] and used as the basis for estimating the size distribution of cable systems.[3] Respondents were drawn from a systematic sample of 100 cable systems throughout the country. Both the head of the household and a randomly selected household member age 12 or older were interviewed in each home contacted.[4] Using a random replacement scheme, 5 percent of the systems were replaced each quarter. Throughout these intervals, interviews were completed to provide a continuous measurement of homes passed by cable. All told, interviews were completed in 60 percent of the eligible homes listed for the survey, yielding 1322 usable responses.

With regard to operational measures, community channels are broadly defined to include PEG as well as community (or leased) access.[5] Criterion measures included household demographic variables and those of the individual household-head. Variables reported here include respondent sex, employment status (unemployed or not), marital status, household size, ethnicity, age, education, and income.[6]

One final environmental variable measured county size (1 if urban, 2 if suburban, 3 if rural) and the number of off-air channels. This was included to examine the role that market-specific variables might play in community channel performance.

In addition to background variables, respondent media use was assessed. Of particular interest, subscribers were asked how much they viewed each of the programming services available in their homes during the week prior to the interview. Actual viewing was

then summed across all of the available channels. And finally, viewer satisfaction with various cable services was gauged on a three-point scale (where 3=very satisfied and 1=somewhat dissatisfied). Respondents were also asked about their awareness and weekly viewership of community channels.

Frequencies were then run on all selected media use and demographic variables. Significance was assessed through Chi-square analysis ($p=\leq.05$). All data were processed with the PSTAT program for personal computers[7].

RESULTS

Statistical results for community and PEG access channels are included for overall viewership (Table 1) as well as viewership and satisfaction by designated subgroups (Tables 2a-9b). Results from further analysis (originally accounting for 30 display tables) will be discussed in narrative form.[8] Attention will be focused on viewership, however, as it is felt to be the most commonly held measure of community channel performance.

1. Overall viewership

Survey results indicate that nearly 60% of all homes passed by cable are served by at least one community channel. This represents a fairly strong audience reach, as 80% of the homes in the U.S. are passed by cable (Baldwin and McVoy, 1988). Thus, even though a minority of cable systems provide community access, they reside in larger markets and are able to reach a majority of subscribers.

As Table 1 shows, 16% of the overall audience reported viewing a community channel within the last week. That level had been holding steady at the 15% level in recent years, while satisfaction declined among subscribers since peaking in 1985. (ELRA, 1984, 1985). By comparison, viewership among other basic cable services ranged as high as 60% during the 1985-86 season. Community channels are not, however, immune to seasonal fluctuations in viewing. Just as researchers (Liebert, Sprafkin and Neale, 1983) find a traditional summer lull in off-air viewing, we see a decline in access viewership during the summers of 1985 and 1986. In terms of quarterly trends (not shown), the drop was most pronounced during the latter year, falling to the 10% level among cable homes.

Community channels do, however, perform consistently better than such satellite-delivered channels as BET, C-SPAN, Financial News Network, PTL and SPN. They can even match the performance of Arts & Entertainment, CBN and Lifetime at certain times. It should also be noted that this comparative data is based on 1985-86 viewership levels, and some of those basic services have increased in popularity since that time. On some individual systems, though, access news and information programming can place among the better-known basic services.

Access satisfaction, by comparison, is measured only among access viewers. On the whole, over 25% of those who have ever viewed say that they're "very satisfied" with community programming. A larger proportion (37%) of weekly viewers express the

same degree of satisfaction. This level is typically lower when broken out by demographic subgroups. In no cases, however, could more than 20-30% of viewers be characterized as "dissatisfied" with access fare.

2. Viewership by age

Further analysis of viewership by age (Table 2a) reveals that 16% reported having viewed during the previous week. Seniors (65+ in age) watch to the greatest degree, while 12-17 year-olds are most likely to "never" watch access programs. The proportion of those who've never viewed increases sequentially as one moves downward in age (across each of the seven categories). We see a similar relationship with those who viewed last week, as viewership increases with age for the last six age groups. While proportions in Table 2b are not significantly differentiated, simple frequencies suggest that those aged 25-34 and over 65 are more likely to be "very satisfied" with programming.

3. Viewership by gender

Though certain age groups do differ from the national average in terms of viewership, there are no significant differences by gender (Table 3a). Analysis of frequencies, however, suggests that males are slightly more likely to have viewed at some point in time (with 60% having "never" viewed, compared to 62% of females). Similarly, in terms of satisfaction (Table 3b), there are no significant differences between males and females. Unlike viewership, however, frequencies suggest that females are more likely to be "very satisfied" (32%) with programming, as compared

to males (23%).

4. Viewership by education

Where differences are minimal between the sexes, Table 4a shows that access viewership is significantly higher among better educated viewers. Specifically, two-thirds of those without a high school education are more likely to report having "never" viewed an access channel, while 43% of college graduates indicate having viewed at some point in time. This relationship is not borne out by satisfaction indices (Table 4b), however, as there are no significant differences among these groups. Further examination of frequencies suggests that college graduates are least satisfied with community channel fare (23% dissatisfied; 24% very satisfied) while 38% of high school non-graduates are "very satisfied".

5. Viewership by occupation

When comparing viewership among those in different occupations (Table 5a), student and unemployed viewers are least likely to view community programming (72% having never done so). Retirees, by comparison, are most likely to have viewed community programming. At least 40% of the retired, white collar and blue collar workers report viewing community fare at some point in time. This proportion was lower for homemakers (38.5%), technical-administrative-sales workers (36.5%) and those who are students or unemployed (27.5%). In terms of recent viewership, retirees are most likely to have viewed last week (22%)--a finding that confirms earlier reported findings on viewing for older age

groups.

This relationship is not apparent in terms of satisfaction, however, as there are no significant differences by occupation (Table 5b). Simple frequencies suggest that white-collar and student/unemployed viewers are least satisfied with community access programming (roughly 19% dissatisfied for each group). 32% of retirees and 34% of technical-administrative and sales workers are "very satisfied".

6. Viewership by income

Table 6a reports findings on viewership across different income categories. Here we see significant differences among various income groups, though no clear trends emerge. Over two-thirds (68%) of low-middle income ($15,000-25,000) viewers report never seeing community access, while roughly 40% of the other groups indicate viewing at some point in time. At the lower end of the spectrum, those earning $7500 or less are most likely to have viewed last week; their 31% viewing level is nearly double that of the category mean. These viewers are also significantly more likely to be "very satisfied" (Table 6b) with programming, with 90% falling into that category. The next highest income group does not, however, share this view; 12% are "very satisfied" and nearly 30% express dissatisfaction with access fare.

7. Viewership by marital status

Viewership is also significantly differentiated by marital status (Table 7a). Here we see that single individuals are least likely to have seen community channels (68% having never viewed)

while their married counterparts were most likely (42%) to have viewed at some point in time. Divorced, separated or widowed subscribers are most likely to have viewed during the previous week. In contrast to viewership, there are no significant marital status differences with satisfaction (Table 7b). Absolute frequency values suggest that divorced, separated or widowed individuals dominate the extreme categories, as they're more likely to be dissatisfied or very satisfied with community access fare.

8. Viewership by ethnicity

Ethnicity provides little basis for significant differences in terms of either viewership (Table 8a) or satisfaction (Table 8b). Viewership frequencies suggest that whites are slightly more likely to have viewed access programming during or before the previous week. With regard to satisfaction, it appears minority viewers are more satisfied with access fare. In terms of ethnicity, then, there is little correspondence with the viewership and satisfaction measures.

9. Viewership by household-size

When examining viewership by household size (Table 9a), we see that four-person homes are most likely (67.5%) to have "never" viewed. One- and three-person homes are significantly more likely to have viewed during the last week (roughly 17% in each case). There are not, however, any significant differences in terms of satisfaction (Table 9b) across those household categories. As with viewership, absolute frequencies suggest that family size

does not have a uni-directional influence with satisfaction.

10. Media environment influences

Further questions were asked of subscribers and nonsubscribers to ascertain their interest in producing access programming of their own. Overall results will be presented in narrative form, as they were based on responses from individual communities. Within these communities, cable subscribers are generally more knowledgeable about access services than their nonsubscribing counterparts, though just under half of the subscribers are interested in access production. There is, however, a gap between interest and action--as fewer than 5% indicate having participated with access. When probed as to their reasons for not engaging in production, most cite a lack of time and motivation. The scarcity of information about how to get involved is the second most widely cited reason; logistical factors such as the availability of studio time and equipment are rarely mentioned as concerns.

In another divergence between satisfaction and viewership measures, satisfaction is lower in systems with 37 or more channels, though viewership is about equal to the national average in those systems. Consistent with that finding, community channel performance is lower in communities with greater population density. Using the A.C. Nielsen A-B-C-D county designations (where A=rural, B=suburban and C,D=rural) it appears urbanites are half as likely to view community channels compared to the national average.

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The findings suggest that access viewers to not fit the young, upscale information seeker profile typical of other heavy news consumers (Tichenor, Donohue and Olien, 1981). While better educated, heavy access viewers are nevertheless likely to be older, retired and have lower incomes. Income was the only corresponding satisfaction measure for which similar differences could be found, as lower income viewers were more satisfied. Perhaps those who cannot easily afford social or media alternatives can better appreciate the community programming alternative.

For the larger audience, the performance of access in terms of viewership seems modest, in comparison with commercial VHF TV. According to the criterion for ratings success among cable services, where a rating of 2-4% is considered strong, access channels nevertheless seem able to hold their own against the competition. Judging purely on the basis of audience viewership and satisfaction, it would seem that community channels have earned a place on the cable roster. That these channels can outperform more lavishly produced basic services should also establish their market value to cable operators.

One might, then, argue that community channels should be worth as much as the basic channels they outperform. Just as operators must pay upwards of a dollar-per subscriber for certain basic services, community programming might warrant a similar degree of commitment. This argument is less appealing, however, when one

considers the production side of the equation. Here we see that community programming operations can cost anywhere from $10 to $100 per subscriber. In those cases, access programming remains the cable operator's "gift" to the community.

It is upon this cost/value relationship that many cable operators will likely base their continued opposition to community programming. Up to this point, that operator reluctance has been offset by city franchise officials seeking to better serve their constituency. However, in light of recent "public relations" concerns, such as the Kansas city debate regarding Ku Klux Klan access, even city support might be in jeopardy. Neither city officials nor cable operators are likely to embrace access until these controversies are settled, and more satisfied viewers are being delivered.

In order to assure their success, access programmers will need to make subscribers aware of the medium's potential as a source for local news and information. Community channels could be one of the most popular forms of cable programming. To date, that promise has not been fully realized in terms of viewership and viewer satisfaction. More community resources will have to be expended to develop and promote community programs, most likely at the grassroots level.

This should provide a needed supplement to conventional funding strategies, where money is obtained directly from the cable operators, and later passed to subscribers in the form of higher monthly fees. Since the value of programming has not

always merited audience support, conventional strategies have forced the majority to pay for the video production interests of a very few. Cable viewers have even had to subsidize the production activities of many users who are not, themselves, subscribers. In light of the recent concerns regarding access programming, such policies are likely to face increased challenges on political as well as economic fronts. Alternative support strategies, including underwriting (for public access), PBS-style auctions, pledge drives and dedicated franchise fees are more palatable options from the perspective of public support.

Results also suggest that access programmers should develop a policy of triage in terms of resource allocation. That is, rather than trying to maximize access, coordinators and access group leaders could focus on a smaller number of higher quality productions. This emphasis of quality over quantity might raise concerns about limiting the debate which public access was originally designed to promote. But, through such mechanisms as mandatory training classes and coordinator-supervised production, it would be possible to reduce some of the sloppiness to which viewers might take exception. This supervision could not, however, extend to the actual substance of access speech.

This area of user involvement is, of course, the only area where public access truly outperforms other public and commercial alternatives. The finding that 5 percent of subscribers have worked with access is rather striking, and raises questions about production resources. For, if that 5% resides in a system with

100,000 subscribers (assuming 2 adults per home) then there would be 10,000 likely users. Assuming that each production takes an hour of studio time, there would be a need for 5 access studios (working 40 hours/week) to meet that demand. This would require one full-time access studio for every 20,000 homes--a level which few systems could meet.

This is, of course, among the worst-case scenarios. In actuality, many community productions involve numerous people--an average of nearly 10 per production. That being the case, the potential demand for a 100,000 home system may be met by a single studio.

CONCLUSION

On balance, community programmers must meet a higher local service mission than their commercial counterparts. Their content--addressing public, educational and governmental affairs--positions them as news and information anomalies in a TV medium heavily skewed towards entertainment. Where public access channels are more entertainment-oriented, they are largely purposive in nature, intending to inform or influence their audience in some way. Hence, by virtue of their local, non-profit orientation, PEG and other locally leased access channels are natural outlets for news on a wide range of ethnic, community and political affairs. Such matters, no doubt, often fall through the cracks of commercial broadcasters--dependent as they are upon the profit motive.

So community programmers have been designed to fill that gap, providing a last channel of access to an electronic medium

characterized by high barriers to entry. Paradoxically, they must increasingly meet the very commercial standards that prompt broadcasters to sacrifice local news in favor of a "tried-n-true" agenda of national issues (e. g. Porter and Banks, 1987). In raising those issues, these and other critics contend that the marketplace criterion is clearly not the most telling measure of access performance. Indeed, as Bretz (1975) notes

> ...if you compare viewership of public access to that of other media, public access looks bad. If, however, you measure the audience in numbers of people, you encourage comparison with other means of gathering people together, such as meeting halls...The audience gathered in a small percentage of a community's cable TV homes might overflow the town's largest auditorium (p. 31).

Notwithstanding this public interest assessment, PEG channels must, in the final analysis, also be judged by their ability to reach viewers and actually achieve desired social effects. This study provides a quantitative gauge of that impact, assuming arguendo that levels of audience knowledge of and concern for access represent measures of public utility. The picture is one of sizable community awareness about access, but only limited support, in terms of willingness to contribute.

In order to complete the picture, it will be important to expand audience research on community programming. In light of the variability in performance of community channels across different markets, access programmers should consider national viewership trends in their planning decisions. This should help them evaluate which programs or channels are successful and hence worthy of additional production or promotional resources. In the case of substandard performance, qualitative research should be

employed to assess audience concerns. This investment, while costly, could pay dividends in helping community programmers improve their performance in the increasingly competitive video marketplace.

ENDNOTES

1.The ELRA group is a privately held company and details of its financing are not publicly available. ELRA group clients include the major cable MSOs, trade associations, programming networks and municipal franchise authorities.

1.Broadcasting/Cablecasting Yearbook 1985, 1986.

2. Following that, the master sample of systems was ranked in order of the number of homes passed and five size strata were created. Twenty percent of the total universe of homes passed by cable were represented by each stratum. Twenty systems were then sampled from each stratum, yielding 100 systems total. Information about the channels carried and the ZIP Codes served was obtained, along with information about the channels carried. A random digit dialing technique was then used in order to select households. This, in turn, provided a nationally representative sample in which all homes passed by cable in the U.S. had an approximately equal chance of being included in the survey.

3.Interviewers first asked to speak to a household head age 18 or older and then used a selection grid to identify a randomly designated respondent in each home. In about 70 percent of the cases the head of the household was designated and answered both sets of questions.

4.Local origination channels (i. e. those programmed by the local cable operator) were not included in the survey.

5.The various background variables were measured as follow. Dummy-coded variables included sex of respondent (1 if female, 0 if male), employment status (1 if unemployed, 0 if not), marital status (1 if married, 0 if not) and ethnicity (1 if white, 0 if not). Respondent age was recorded in years (with a mean of 45.9). Additionally, total number of persons in the home and number of children aged 13 or under were also entered. An ordinal education scale was used with five levels (1 if less than high school, 2 if high school diploma, 3 if attended college without completing, 4 if college graduate, 5 if graduate training). Household income was measured on a seven-level ordinal scale (1 if $7500 or less, 2 if $7501-$10,000, 3 if $10,001 to $15,000, 4 if $15,000 to $25,000, 5 if $25,000 to $35,001, 6 if $35,001 to $50,000, 7 if over $50,000).

6. Frequencies reported in the text reflect weighted sample values in Table 1.

7.Further information on data analysis procedures or tabular background is available from the authors.

TABLE 1: WEEKLY VIEWERSHIP OF BASIC CABLE SERVICES

SERVICE	WEEKLY VIEWERSHIP[1] (CUMULATIVE)
CNN	61%
WTBS	58%
ESPN	47%
ARTS & ENT.	26%
CBN	21%
LIFETIME	20%
ACCESS	13.6%
BET	13%
C-SPAN	12%
FNN	10%
SPN	8%
PTL	7.5%

[1] Based upon 2nd and 3rd quarter viewing, 1986 (n=1000)

95% confidence = ±3.5%

TABLE 2a: ACCESS VIEWERSHIP BY AGE

ACCESS VIEWERSHIP	AGE 12-17	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	Missing	Row Totals
Never	73	74	203	141	107	105	97		800
	9.1	9.2	25.4	17.6	13.4	13.1	12.1		100.0
	73.7	67.9	63.4	61.6	58.2	60.0	54.8		61.8
None Last Wk	8	22	73	54	48	40	38	1	284
	2.8	7.7	25.7	19.0	16.9	14.1	13.4	0.4	100.0
	8.1	20.2	22.8	23.6	26.1	22.9	21.5	100.0	21.9
Viewed Last Wk	18	13	44	34	29	30	42		210
	8.6	6.2	21.0	16.2	13.8	14.3	20.0		100.0
	18.2	11.9	13.8	14.8	15.8	17.1	23.7		16.2
Total N	99	109	320	229	184	175	177	1	1294
Row Pct	7.7	8.4	24.7	17.7	14.2	13.5	13.7	0.1	100.0
Col Pct	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Chi Square = 28.4651 (PR=0.013)
Worst Expected Value = 0.1623
D.F. = 14.0000

Cell Contents Include
Cell Counts
Row Percent
Column Percent

TABLE 2b: ACCESS SATISFACTION BY AGE

ACCESS SATISFACTION	AGE 12-17	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	Missing	Totals
Somewhat Dissati	3	7	21	11	13	9	10		74
	4.1	9.5	28.4	14.9	17.6	12.2	13.5		100.0
	13.0	20.0	19.8	13.4	18.1	15.3	14.9		16.6
Somewhat Satisfi	13	18	51	54	44	31	32	1	244
	5.3	7.4	20.9	22.1	18.0	12.7	13.1	0.4	100.0
	56.5	51.4	48.1	65.9	61.1	52.5	47.8	100.0	54.8
Very Satisfied	7	10	34	17	15	19	25		127
	5.5	7.9	26.8	13.4	11.8	15.0	19.7		100.0
	30.4	28.6	32.1	20.7	20.8	32.2	37.3		28.5
Total N	23	35	106	82	72	59	67	1	445
Row Pct	5.2	7.9	23.8	18.4	16.2	13.3	15.1	0.2	100.0
Col Pct	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Chi Square = 12.4561 (PR=0.570)
Worst Expected Value = 0.1663
D.F. = 14.0000

TABLE 3a: ACCESS VIEWERSHIP BY GENDER

	SEX		Row
	Female	Male	Totals
Never	476	338	814
	58.5	41.5	100.0
	62.3	60.6	61.6
None Last Wk	164	128	292
	56.2	43.8	100.0
	21.5	22.9	22.1
Viewed Last	124	92	216
Wk	57.4	42.6	100.0
	16.2	16.5	16.3
Total N	764	558	1322
Row Pct	57.8	42.2	100.0
Col Pct	100.0	100.0	100.0

Chi Square = 0.4866 (PR=0.784)
Worst Expected Value = 91.1710
D.F. = 2.0000

TABLE 3b: ACCESS SATISFACTION BY GENDER

ACCESS	SEX		Row
SATISFACTION	Female	Male	Totals
Somewhat	43	34	77
Dissati	55.8	44.2	100.0
	16.5	17.3	16.9
Somewhat	134	117	251
Satisfi	53.4	46.6	100.0
	51.5	59.7	55.0
Very	83	45	128
Satisfied	64.8	35.2	100.0
	31.9	23.0	28.1
Total N	260	196	456
Row Pct	57.0	43.0	100.0
Col Pct	100.0	100.0	100.0

Chi Square = 4.5926 (PR=0.101)
Worst Expected Value = 33.0965
D.F. = 2.0000

Cell Contents Include
Cell Counts
Row Percent
Column Percent

TABLE 4a: ACCESS VIEWERSHIP BY EDUCATION

ACCESS VIEWERSHIP	Less than HS	HS Grad	Some College	College Grad	Row Totals
Never	138	259	200	203	800
	17.2	32.4	25.0	25.4	100.0
	67.0	62.9	62.3	56.7	61.7
None Last Wk	28	86	81	89	284
	9.9	30.3	28.5	31.3	100.0
	13.6	20.9	25.2	24.9	21.9
Viewed Last Wk	40	67	40	66	213
	18.8	31.5	18.8	31.0	100.0
	19.4	16.3	12.5	18.4	16.4
Total N	206	412	321	358	1297
Row Pct	15.9	31.8	24.7	27.6	100.0
Col Pct	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Chi Square = 17.3288 (PR=0.009)
Worst Expected Value = 33.8304
D.F. = 6.0000

TABLE 4b: ACCESS SATISFACTION BY EDUCATION

ACCESS SATIS-FACTION	Less than HS	HS Grad	Some College	College Grad	Row Totals
Somewhat Dissati	6	15	22	32	75
	8.0	20.0	29.3	42.7	100.0
	10.3	11.2	19.1	22.7	16.7
Somewhat Satisfi	30	78	64	75	247
	12.1	31.6	25.9	30.4	100.0
	51.7	58.2	55.7	53.2	55.1
Very Satisfied	22	41	29	34	126
	17.5	32.5	23.0	27.0	100.0
	37.9	30.6	25.2	24.1	28.1
Total N	58	134	115	141	448
Row Pct	12.9	29.9	25.7	31.5	100.0
Col Pct	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Chi Square = 11.1390 (PR=0.085)
Worst Expected Value = 9.7098
D.F. = 6.0000

Cell Contents Include
Cell Counts
Row Percent
Column Percent

TABLE 5a: ACCESS VIEWERSHIP BY OCCUPATION

ACCESS VIEWERSHIP	White Collar	Tech-Admin-Sales	Blue Collar	Home maker	Student-Unemploy	Re-tired	Row Totals
Never	179	164	125	89	105	129	791
	22.6	20.7	15.8	11.3	13.3	16.3	100.0
	59.5	63.6	59.2	61.8	72.4	57.6	61.7
None Last Wk	74	58	52	36	18	46	284
	26.1	20.4	18.3	12.7	6.3	16.2	100.0
	24.6	22.5	24.6	25.0	12.4	20.5	22.1
Viewed Last Wk	48	36	34	19	22	49	208
	23.1	17.3	16.3	9.1	10.6	23.6	100.0
	15.9	14.0	16.1	13.2	15.2	21.9	16.2
Total N	301	258	211	144	145	224	1283
Row Pct	23.5	20.1	16.4	11.2	11.3	17.5	100.0
Col Pct	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Chi Square = 18.4850 (PR=0.049)
Worst Expected Value = 23.3453
D.F. = 10.0000

TABLE 5b: ACCESS SATISFACTION BY OCCUPATION

ACCESS SATISFACTION	White Collar	Tech-Admin-Sales	Blue Collar	Home maker	Student-Unemploy	Re-tired	Row Totals
Somewhat Dissati	22	8	12	10	7	14	73
	30.1	11.0	16.4	13.7	9.6	19.2	100.0
	19.6	9.1	15.6	18.5	19.4	18.2	16.4
Somewhat Satisfi	63	50	48	26	20	38	245
	25.7	20.4	19.6	10.6	8.2	15.5	100.0
	56.2	56.8	62.3	48.1	55.6	49.4	55.2
Very Satisfied	27	30	17	18	9	25	126
	21.4	23.8	13.5	14.3	7.1	19.8	100.0
	24.1	34.1	22.1	33.3	25.0	32.5	28.4
Total N	112	88	77	54	36	77	444
Row Pct	25.2	19.8	17.3	12.2	8.1	17.3	100.0
Col Pct	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Chi Square = 9.7201 (PR=0.466)
Worst Expected Value = 5.9189
D.F. = 10.0000

Cell Contents Include
Cell Counts
Row Percent
Column Percent

TABLE 6a: ACCESS VIEWERSHIP BY INCOME

ACCESS V'SHIP	<$7500	$7501- $10,000	$10,001 -$15,0	$15,001 - $25,0	$25,001 -$35,0	$35,001 -$50,0	Over $50,000	Totals
Never	24	29	49	158	198	132	107	697
	3.4	4.2	7.0	22.7	28.4	18.9	15.4	100.0
	61.5	59.2	57.6	68.1	61.9	60.6	56.9	61.6
None	3	13	18	36	75	57	53	255
Last Wk	1.2	5.1	7.1	14.1	29.4	22.4	20.8	100.0
	7.7	26.5	21.2	15.5	23.4	26.1	28.2	22.5
Viewed	12	7	18	38	47	29	28	179
Last Wk	6.7	3.9	10.1	21.2	26.3	16.2	15.6	100.0
	30.8	14.3	21.2	16.4	14.7	13.3	14.9	15.8

Total N	39	49	85	232	320	218	188	1131
Row Pct	3.4	4.3	7.5	20.5	28.3	19.3	16.6	100.0
Col Pct	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Chi Square = 24.3070 (PR=0.019)
Worst Expected Value = 6.1724
D.F. = 12.0000

Cell Contents Include
Cell Counts
Row Percent
Column Percent

TABLE 6b: ACCESS SATISFACTION BY INCOME

ACCESS SAT.	$7500 or Less	$7501 to $10,000	$10,001 to $15,0	$15,001 to $25,0	$25,001 to $35,0	$35,001 to $50,0	Over $50,000	Row Totals
Somewhat Dissati		5	2	11	17	15	12	62
		8.1	3.2	17.7	27.4	24.2	19.4	100.0
		29.4	6.1	16.9	15.2	18.8	16.4	15.9
Somewhat Satisfi	1	10	16	35	68	44	45	219
	0.5	4.6	7.3	16.0	31.1	20.1	20.5	100.0
	10.0	58.8	48.5	53.8	60.7	55.0	61.6	56.2
Very Satisfied	9	2	15	19	27	21	16	109
	8.3	1.8	13.8	17.4	24.8	19.3	14.7	100.0
	90.0	11.8	45.5	29.2	24.1	26.2	21.9	27.9
Total N	10	17	33	65	112	80	73	390
Row Pct	2.6	4.4	8.5	16.7	28.7	20.5	18.7	100.0
Col Pct	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Chi Square = 31.7520 (PR=0.002)
Worst Expected Value = 1.5897
D.F. = 12.0000

Cell Contents Include
Cell Counts
Row Percent
Column Percent

TABLE 7a: ACCESS VIEWERSHIP BY MARITAL.STATUS

ACCESS VIEWERSHIP	Single	Div-Sep-Wid	Married	Row Totals
Never	222	147	435	804
	27.6	18.3	54.1	100.0
	68.3	63.9	57.7	61.4
None Last Wk	52	38	199	289
	18.0	13.1	68.9	100.0
	16.0	16.5	26.4	22.1
Viewed Last Wk	51	45	120	216
	23.6	20.8	55.6	100.0
	15.7	19.6	15.9	16.5
Total N	325	230	754	1309
Row Pct	24.8	17.6	57.6	100.0
Col Pct	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Chi Square = 21.0550 (PR=0.000)
Worst Expected Value = 37.9526
D.F. = 4.0000

Cell Contents Include
Cell Counts
Row Percent
Column Percent

TABLE 7b: ACCESS SATISFACTION BY MARITAL STATUS

ACCESS SAT.	Single	Div-Sep-Wid	Married	Row Totals
Somewhat Dissati	14	13	49	76
	18.4	17.1	64.5	100.0
	15.2	18.1	16.8	16.7
Somewhat Satisfi	52	32	167	251
	20.7	12.7	66.5	100.0
	56.5	44.4	57.4	55.2
Very Satisfied	26	27	75	128
	20.3	21.1	58.6	100.0
	28.3	37.5	25.8	28.1
Total N	92	72	291	455
Row Pct	20.2	15.8	64.0	100.0
Col Pct	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Chi Square = 4.8173 (PR=0.307)
Worst Expected Value = 12.0264
D.F. = 4.0000

Cell Contents Include
Cell Counts
Row Percent
Column Percent

TABLE 8a: ACCESS VIEWERSHIP BY ETHNICITY

ACCESS VIEWERSHIP	White	Minority	Row Totals
Never	715	85	800
	89.4	10.6	100.0
	61.0	64.9	61.4
None Last Wk	265	25	290
	91.4	8.6	100.0
	22.6	19.1	22.3
Viewed Last Wk	192	21	213
	90.1	9.9	100.0
	16.4	16.0	16.3
Total N	1172	131	1303
Row Pct	89.9	10.1	100.0
Col Pct	100.0	100.0	100.0

Chi Square = 0.9562 (PR=0.620)
Worst Expected Value = 21.4144
D.F. = 2.0000

Cell Contents Include
Cell Counts
Row Percent
Column Percent

TABLE 8b: ACCESS SATISFACTION BY ETHNICITY

ACCESS SAT.	White	Minority	Row Totals
Somewhat Dissati	72	5	77
	93.5	6.5	100.0
	17.6	11.6	17.1
Somewhat Satisfi	224	24	248
	90.3	9.7	100.0
	54.9	55.8	55.0
Very Satisfied	112	14	126
	88.9	11.1	100.0
	27.5	32.6	27.9
Total N	408	43	451
Row Pct	90.5	9.5	100.0
Col Pct	100.0	100.0	100.0

Chi Square = 1.1945 (PR=0.551)
Worst Expected Value = 7.3415
D.F. = 2.0000

TABLE 9a: ACCESS VIEWERSHIP BY HOUSEHOLD SIZE

ACCESS VIEWERSHIP	HH.SIZE 1 Person	2	3	4	Row Totals
Never	168	380	135	131	814
	20.6	46.7	16.6	16.1	100.0
	66.1	58.5	60.3	67.5	61.6
None Last Wk	42	167	50	33	292
	14.4	57.2	17.1	11.3	100.0
	16.5	25.7	22.3	17.0	22.1
Viewed Last Wk	44	103	39	30	216
	20.4	47.7	18.1	13.9	100.0
	17.3	15.8	17.4	15.5	16.3
Total N	254	650	224	194	1322
Row Pct	19.2	49.2	16.9	14.7	100.0
Col Pct	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Chi Square = 13.1955 (PR=0.041)
Worst Expected Value = 31.6974
D.F. = 6.0000

Cell Contents Include
Cell Counts
Row Percent
Column Percent

TABLE 9b: ACCESS SATISFACTION BY HOUSEHOLD SIZE

ACC. SAT.	1 Person	2	3	4	Row Totals
Somewhat Dissati	12	44	11	10	77
	15.6	57.1	14.3	13.0	100.0
	16.7	18.1	13.8	16.4	16.9
Somewhat Satisfi	38	136	42	35	251
	15.1	54.2	16.7	13.9	100.0
	52.8	56.0	52.5	57.4	55.0
Very Satisfied	22	63	27	16	128
	17.2	49.2	21.1	12.5	100.0
	30.6	25.9	33.8	26.2	28.1
Total N	72	243	80	61	456
Row Pct	15.8	53.3	17.5	13.4	100.0
Col Pct	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Chi Square = 2.5000 (PR=0.041)
Worst Expected Value = 10.3004
D.F. = 6.0000

Cell Contents Include
Cell Counts
Row Percent
Column Percent

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Advocat, S. "Cable offers access, but few watch." Detroit Free Press (April 29, 1984), pp. 1c, 6c.

Baldwin, T.F. and McVoy, D.S. Cable Communications, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1988.

Bretz, J. "Public cable TV: audiences." Journal of Communication (Summer 1975).

Cable Communications Policy Act of 1984, P.L. 98-549, 47 U.S.C.A. 151 et seq.

Doty, P. "Public access Cable TV: Who cares." Journal of Communication (Summer, 1975).

Editors, Broadcasting/Cablecasting Yearbook, Broadcasting Publications, Inc, Washington, D.C., 1985, 1986.

ELRA, CableMark Probe, syndicated cable audience research service of the ELRA Group, San Francisco, CA, 1985, 1986.

Engel, J.F., Kollat, D.T. and Blackwell, R.D. Consumer behavior. (2nd ed.) New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1975.

Krugman, D. "Evaluating audiences of new media." Journal of Advertising Research (May/June, 1985).

F.C.C. v. Midwest Video Corp. (II), 440 U.S. 689.

Johnson, W. and D. Agostino. "Public access: response to Programming." Journal of Communication (Summer 1975).

LaRose, B. and D. Atkin, "Cable subscribership as telecommunications behavior," Journal of Telematics and Informatics, upcoming, Fall, 1988.

Liebert, R.M., J.N. Sprafkin and E.S. Davidson, The early window, New York: Pergamon Press, 1982.

Nightline, New York: A.B.C. News, June 3, 1988

Owen, B., J. Beebe and W.G. Manning, Television Economics. Lexington, Mass: Lexington Books, D.C. Heath and Company, 1974.

Porter, G. and M. Banks, "Public access cable viewership." Paper presented to the News Division, Broadcast Education Association, Dallas, TX, April, 1987.

Schmidt, B. Freedom of the press vs. public access. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1976.

Strother, L., interview, United Cablevision, East Lansing, MI, July, 1985

Tichenor, P., G.A. Donohue and C.N. Olien. Community Conflict and the Press. Beverly Hills: Sage, 1980.

U.S. v. Midwest Video Corp. (I), 406 U.S. 649 (1972).

Verska, D., "Local origination on cable attracts interest." Electronic Media, Nov. 4, 1984.

Wurtzel, A. "Public access cable TV: programming. Journal of Communication (Summer 1975).